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Reviewer's report:

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to review this powerful, useful, and refreshing paper which provides an intuitive expression of the context of the researcher within participatory research. I think this provokes insight and consideration into an underutilised, yet important paradigm of research enquiry. A particularly pertinent area for health research and deconstruction of data. I particularly enjoyed the honest accounts of researcher's humanness and moral drive. This is rarely discussed and yet plays an important role in the extensive and tireless work that we tend to do.

I have a few comments, which I feel would add to the quality and/or readability of the paper. I have broken them down into sections for clarity.

Abstract:

The methods would benefit from a brief outline of what particular approaches were used to collect data and triangulate within the autoethnography and also a brief description of approaches to analysis.

The second theme - is this the author's blind spots or blind spots in the implementation process as a whole?

Captures implementation processes and outcomes in what way?

Background

In the second paragraph, can you give some examples of "emotionally-charged challenges" to provide some context here for this statement?

Can you also outline why/how the chaos of participatory research challenges the usability of implementation theories, methods, and strategies? Are you suggesting that these are not, generally, considered flexible enough for healthcare contexts?

The authors argue that autoethnography is an appropriate method to investigate current implementation blind spots such as researchers' situatedness within participatory processes - but
does it not do even more than that? Such as what the impact of determining these blind spots? And understanding the impact of the author's situatedness? So as not to presume or take for granted the veracity of the author on data analysis. Afterall, the qualitative researcher is crucial to interpretation of qualitative data and the manuscript might benefit from some attention to this matter.

Methods and Results

I think both the methods and 'Restorying: Plot and Setting' within the results could be made to be more succinct to represent and provide more clarity around the key points here and reduce the word count down for the reader.

Under 'Restorying: Characters, Conflicts, and Themes' can you elaborate what is meant by "Beneath the concrete academic resources, the investigators' lived experience demonstrated their situatedness as human beings (42) with ever-present emotions and values, as well as finite time and energy."

I feel that while this theme provides fascinating and intriguing insights, there is a distinct proportion of this which could be moved into the conclusion as it doesn't directly refer to the results and is more focused on the interpretation of the results. I feel that this would focus the reader.

Restorying: Resolution

In terms of shifting behaviours and micro-practices to optimise own situatedness, I think after listing the changes in behaviours, it would be beneficial to briefly describe how these changes did optimise own situatedness.

Discussion

The discussion is particularly well and sensitively articulated with reference to the findings, other research and useful suggests for moving forward and advice for other Implementation Scientists.

Conclusion

The conclusion is also well articulated and summarised, but I think the manuscript could benefit from some slight elaboration on the final sentence.
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